



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,661	10/30/2001	Thomas A. Wucherer	TRIRG-08851US0	4969
80364	7590	10/14/2008		
TRIRIGA Inc. 6700 Via Austi Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89119				
EXAMINER				
ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2165				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,661

Applicant(s)

WUCHERER ET AL.

Examiner

NEVEEN ABEL JALIL

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 12 2008 has been entered.

2. In response to the Amendment filed on September 12 2008, claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 20-26 have been marked as withdrawn by the Applicant, therefore, claims 1-19 are presented for examination below.

3. Applicant's amendment has overcome some of the previously imposed specification objections, claim objections, and rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter (See claim 1 for example). See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Only support for the term "data unit" is found in paragraph 0055 which is not in relevance to the claimed multiple instances.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

For claim 4, line 2, the term “specification list” has neither definition nor any other mention beyond the claims in the specification

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1, 4, 5, and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Language such as “configured to” “is displayable” and “to be linked” found in various claims (claim 1, claim 4, etc.) does not impart any functionality. In fact, just as it suggests, it merely is a mention of capability of system and thus not fitting within a construction of a method claim. Claim 4, line 15, recites the term “to be linked” without offering any reasonable tie-in with the rest of the limitations. How is it linked? By the interface?

Claim 5, recites “receive” and “link” as part of claimed limitation directed to a User Interface, since the terms are passive verbs not written as “action verbs” it implies that they are merely features of a User interface and not in fact imparting any functionality.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is written awkwardly, while it appears that initially the claim is discussing what a GUI is capable of doing, it later jumps to receiving and generating of the already displayed information. Thus being out of order. The claim should be re-written in more accurate sequential order and to clearly show the method steps involved in the invention. The claim as it is mixes the hardware display of a GUI with functionality beyond “displaying”. Correction is respectfully requested. The deficiency has not been adequately addressed by Applicant’s amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loveland (U.S. Patent No. 6,826,539 B2) in view of McClendon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,619 B1).

As to claims 1, and 5, Loveland discloses a method of managing facilities data, the method being executable by a host computer system comprising:

receiving a first graphical element comprising a computer aided design CAD element, area, or sub area entered by a user as an image displayed on a monitor of a first computer system (See column 6, lines 21-32, also see Figure 19, 222, Upload Image); and

displaying a graphical user interface on the monitor of the first computer system, wherein the graphical user interface is configured to:

receiving the first component specification into the graphical user interface, the first component specification comprising at least one non-graphical data element representing a physical or functional attribute and at least one data element representing a non-physical and non-functional attribute into the graphical user interface (See column 4, lines 61-67, also see column 15, lines 56-65);

transmitting said link data and said first component specification including the non-graphical data element and said data element representing the non-physical and non-functional attribute as a data unit to a database via internet communication by the first computer system (See column 2, lines 23-40).

Loveland discloses the claimed invention except for receive non-graphical information associated with the first graphical element including a first component specification; and

link information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the graphical element, area, or sub area, by generating link data associated with the CAD element and component specifications (Does that include both first and second specification ?, the limitation is awkwardly written), at least one component specification including the first component specification.

Loveland doesn't explicitly teach linking of components and specification. However, Loveland in Figure 2, column 8, line 1-14, shows how components are linked to attributes, specifications, and photos. Loveland teaches storing specification in a database in column 2, lines 24-36, and column 17, lines 13-35.

McClendon et al. teaches receive non-graphical information associated with the first graphical element including a first component specification; and

link information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the graphical element, area, or sub area, by generating link data associated with the graphical element and component specifications, a at least one component specification including the first component specification (See McClendon et al. Figure 2, also see McClendon et al. column 9, lines 8-32, and McClendon et al. column 14, lines 28-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Loveland by the teachings of McClendon et al. to include receive non-graphical information associated with the first graphical element including a first component specification; and link information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the graphical element, area, or sub area, by generating link data associated with the graphical element and component specifications, a at least one component specification including the first component specification because it provides for ease of maintenance, and accuracy of records related to CAD project (See McClendon et al. column 4, lines 1-16).

As to claim 2, Loveland as modified discloses wherein the first computer system comprises a CAD computer system and wherein the CAD element is a first CAD graphical element, the first graphical element comprising the first CAD graphical element (See column 15, lines 35-55).

As to claim 3, Loveland as modified discloses wherein the graphical user interface comprises a plurality of fields, wherein the first component specification comprises a plurality of non-graphical information, and wherein entering the first component specification into the graphical user interface comprises entering the plurality of non-graphical information components into the plurality of fields of the graphical user interface (See column 9, lines 43-53, also see column 10, lines 6-17).

As to claim 4, Loveland as modified discloses the first computer system receiving, via internet communication, specification list data, wherein specification list data represents a list of specifications displayable on the monitor of the first computer system, wherein each specification of the list represents a data unit stored in the database in data communication with the first computer system, wherein each data unit contains data representing non-graphical information (See column 17, lines 26-50, also see column 4, lines 61-67, also see column 15, lines 56-65);

the first computer system displaying the list of specifications (See column 13, lines 53-67);

adding a second graphical element to the image displayed on the monitor of the first computer system (See column 13, lines 53-67, also see column 15, lines 35-67, more than one graphical element can be stored and viewed by the user);

the first computer system transmitting second graphical element data to the database via internet communication, wherein the second graphical element data represents the second graphical element (See column 18, lines 45-65, also see column 17, lines 30-62, teaches listing of more than one graphical element, and also teaches the database to be central or master wherein numerous users have access to it);

the first computer system transmitting link data to the database via internet communication, wherein the link data indicates that one of the data units associated with the specifications in the specification list stored in the database is to be linked within the database to the second graphical element data after the second graphical element data is stored in the database (See column 18, lines 45-65, also see column 17, lines 30-62, teaches listing of more than one graphical element).

As to claim 6, and 18, Loveland discloses a method operating on a processor comprising:
a database receiving and storing first computer aided design CAD element data generated by a first computer system in data communication with the database, wherein the first CAD element data represents a first CAD element, area, or sub area displayable on a monitor (See column 16, lines 30-55, teaches accessing the web interface via a communication network);
a database receiving and storing, as a component specification comprising a single data unit, at least one non-graphical data element representing a physical or functional attribute, and

at least one data element representing a non-physical and non-functional attribute (See column 4, lines 61-67, also see column 15, lines 56-65).

Loveland discloses the claimed invention except for creating and storing a link in the database between data unit and the first graphical element and a second data unit, wherein the data unit stores first non-graphical information data, and wherein the database is configured to link one of the plurality of component specifications to a second of the plurality of component specifications.

Loveland doesn't explicitly teach wherein the database is configured to link one of the plurality of component specifications to a second of the plurality of component specifications. However, Loveland in Figure 2, column 8, line 1-14, shows how components are linked to attributes, specifications, and photos stored in repository.

McClendon et al. teaches creating a link in the database between data unit and a first graphical element or a second data unit, wherein the link can be created between either the first graphical element or the second data unit, in the database wherein the data unit stores first non-graphical information data, and wherein the database is configured to link one of the plurality of component specifications to a second of the plurality of component specifications (See McClendon et al. Figure 2, also see McClendon et al. column 9, lines 8-32, and McClendon et al. column 14, lines 28-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Loveland by the teachings of McClendon et al. to include creating a link in the database between data unit and a first graphical element or a second data unit, wherein the link can be created between either the first graphical element or the second data unit,

in the database wherein the data unit stores first non-graphical information data, and wherein the database is configured to link one of the plurality of component specifications to a second of the plurality of component specifications because it provides for ease of maintenance, and accuracy of records related to CAD project (See McClendon et al., column 4, lines 1-16).

As to claim 7, Loveland as modified discloses the computer system transmitting the first graphical element data to a second computer system via internet communication (See column 6, lines 60-67) the computer system transmitting the first non-graphical data unit to the second computer system via internet communication (See column 16, lines 41-67, wherein “second computer system” reads on project has been published and made available for access by variety of users across the network).

As to claim 8, Loveland as modified discloses:

the computer system receiving second graphical element data via internet communication from a second computer system, wherein the second graphical element data represents a second graphical element which is displayable on a monitor of the second computer system (See column 9, lines 43-53, also see column 10, lines 6-17, also see column 16, lines 41-67, wherein “second computer system” reads on project has been published and made available for access by variety of users across the network);

the computer system storing the second graphical element data into the database (See column 4, lines 61-67, also see column 15, lines 56-65); and

creating and storing a link within the database between the second graphical element data and the first data unit after the second graphical element data is stored in the database (See column 8, lines 1-27, wherein “after.. is stored” reads on “completed projects”).

As to claim 9, Loveland as modified discloses the computer system sending, via internet communication, list data to the first computer system (See column 6, lines 60-67, also see column 8, lines 41-62), wherein the list data represents a list of non-graphical data units in the database, wherein each non-graphical data unit stores non-graphical information data, wherein the list of non-graphical data units includes the first non-graphical data unit (See column 9, lines 54-65, wherein “list” reads on “file” that is of many stored in a database).

As to claim 10, Loveland discloses the computer system receiving an additional non-graphical data element from a second computer system via Internet communication (See column 6, lines 60-67, also see column 8, lines 41-62); and

the computer system storing the additional non-graphical data element in the first non-graphical data unit (See column 9, lines 54-65).

As to claim 11, Loveland as modified discloses comprising the computer system storing the first graphical element data in a first graphical data unit in the database, wherein the first graphical data unit stores additional graphical element data (See column 9, lines 54-65).

As to claim 12, Loveland as modified wherein graphical user interface includes:

receiving a selection from a collection of graphical elements (i.e. project);
a second portion in the first window for receiving a selection of CAD object associated with the collection;

receiving a selection of a component specifications;
viewing attributes for a selected component specifications; and
linking the selected component specifications to a selected CAD object.

The claim as whole is generally interpreted on GUI and its inherent features (See Loveland column 8, lines 1-14, and see Loveland column 9, lines 43-53, also see Loveland column 10, lines 6-17).

As to claim 13, Loveland as modified wherein the graphical user interface includes:
a viewing components specifications linked to the selected CAD object; and
creating a new component specification.

Again generally interpreted on a conventional GUI with its inherent features (See Loveland column 8, lines 1-14, and see Loveland column 9, lines 25-32).

As to claim 14, Loveland discloses one or more memory mediums having processor readable code embodied on said memory mediums, said processor readable code for programming a processor to perform a method comprising:

receiving a data unit including at least one data element representing a non-graphical data element representing physical or functional attribute and at least one data element representing a non-physical and non-functional attribute via a network interface from a first computer system

(See column 9, lines 43-65) the data unit associated with a first graphical element comprising a computer aided design CAD element, area, or sub area, the computer system receiving the data unit through a graphical user interface (See column 16, lines 14-25, column 16, lines 35-40, and see Figure 22, wherein “data unit” is deemed to “project file” for a created CAD project and stored a single file in the mast structure data), the graphical user interface configured to:

updating a database, wherein said data unit which includes at least one data element representing a physical or a functional attribute is stored in the database (See column 10, lines 22-50).

Loveland discloses the claimed invention except for receive non-graphical information associated with a selected graphical element including a component specification, and

link information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the CAD element, area, or sub area;

generating link data associated with the CAD element and component specifications.

Loveland doesn't explicitly teach linking of components and specification. However, Loveland in Figure 2, column 8, line 1-14, shows how components are linked to attributes, specifications, and photos. Loveland also teaches storing items as files in a database (i.e. generating a link) in column 6, lines 44-67.

McClendon et al. teaches receiving non-graphical information associated with a selected graphical element including a component specification, and link information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the CAD element, area, or sub area; generating link data associated with the CAD element and component specifications (See

McClendon et al. Figure 2, also see McClendon et al. column 9, lines 8-32, and McClendon et al. column 14, lines 28-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Loveland by the teachings of McClendon et al. to include receiving non-graphical information associated with a selected graphical element including a component specification, and linking information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the CAD element, area, or sub area generating link data associated with the CAD element and component specifications because it provides for ease of maintenance, and accuracy of records related to CAD project (See McClendon et al. column 4, lines 1-16).

As to claim 15, Loveland as modified discloses linking said at least one data element representing the physical or the functional within the attribute within the database to a first graphical element data stored in the database (See Loveland column 9, lines 25-32, also see McClendon et al. Figure 2, also see McClendon et al. column 6, lines 1-15).

As to claim 16, Loveland as modified discloses comprising transmitting data representing a first component specification to a second computer system via internet communication, wherein the data representing the first component specification comprises data representing non-graphical information, wherein the data representing the first component specification is transmitted after the said step of linking said at least one data element (See column 9, lines 1-30, also see column 16, lines 14-24, wherein all project files including linked components are made

available on the Internet).

As to claim 17, Loveland as modified discloses comprising receiving and modifying the non-graphical information displayed in fields of an interface (See column 9, lines 43-53, also see column 10, lines 6-17).

As to claim 19, Loveland as modified discloses wherein the first computer system is coupled to the database via the Internet (See column 6, lines 60-67).

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed on September 12 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument that "Loveland does not teach or disclose that the links are considered independently of the two or more elements they connect. (noting Column 8, lines 1-14) These sections do not teach the "generating link data associated with the graphical element and component specification"" is noted but not found to be persuasive.

As a start, claim 1 recites "link information for at least one component specification to a second component specification and the CAD graphical element by generating link data associated with the element and component specifications, the at least one component specification including the first" all of which constitute what is being displayed to the user via

GUI and latter available, as information relevant to the displayed link, for storage within the database.

Secondly, Applicant's argument is misleading since the term "link data" as previously mentioned is nowhere to be found in Applicant's specification. Therefore, it is reasonable for the Examiner to take the broadest reasonable interpretation in equating it to attribute of link (i.e. information about the link) such as an object library. Loveland as a whole creates a virtual directory structure (see abstract) and McClendon teaches taxonomy (i.e. hierarchical linked structure) as disclosed in column 19, lines 36-56 and column 20, lines 19-24.

Applicant's secondary argument that McClendon's "link manager" is a distinct mechanism created to link various elements between applications" is irrelevant to the claims since regardless of the set up in McClendon, the "link manager" is able to perform the functionality of linking various data together. In McClendon, the overall central database system including the control offered by the "link manager" is depicted by column 22, lines 35-50 which is no different than what is stated in the argued limitations (i.e. creating links between data and associating or recording information relative to said link or preexisting link). If the "generated link" functions in specific way or represent specific data that is novel and detailed then it should be adequately specified in the claims.

McClendon does not disclose the "generating link data" as it is claimed in Applicant's claims 1, 5, 6, 14, and 18 as currently amended. The creation of an independent mechanism that

actively links between various systems is not analogous to that is claimed by Applicant" is noted but not deemed to be persuasive.

Beyond the teachings of "link manager" in McClendon, Applicant's own specification in various examples, define "generating a link" or "existing link" are nothing more than on screen associations (visual tree) or database library in the form of directory or an index able to access and modify relationships. Applicant's Specification and in particulate in paragraphs:

[0082] The expanded CAD Object Manager also displays a tree in window 150 that identifies component specifications linked to the component specification identified in the Specification field. In the illustrated example, window 150 shows that the exemplary Hotel Restaurant Dinning Area Chair component specification, identified as HRDAC, includes links to other component specifications designated Fabric 1 and Scotchguard which may relate to fabric and fabric treatment sub-components, respectively, of the exemplary dinning room chair. Clicking on or selecting any of these linked component specifications causes the Attributes, Status, Quantities, and Costs tabs to be updated with fields of information from the linked component specification. A user, initiating the AddSubSpec button, can link the component specification identified in the Specification field to another component specification. For example, the user can add a component specification relating to a particular wood stain of the Stain group file. The Remove button may be initiated by the user to remove a component specification linked to the component specification identified in the Specification field.

[0083] A user may create a new component specification for a CAD element. The user may initiate the New Spec button of the CAD Object Manager to clear all the information in all the fields and window 150. Thereafter, the user may select and enter a group code from the group code drop-down menu into the Group field. The selected group code will designate one of the group files in file 60 into which the new component specification is to be stored. The user may then enter a new component specification name or code into the Specification field to identify the new component specification. Lastly, the user can enter information into the existing fields of the tabs or newly created fields of the tabs, or add links to other component specifications using the AddSubSpec button. After the newly created component specification is complete, the user can activate the Apply button and link a selected CAD element. The newly created component specification also will be stored in the appropriate group file of file 60 and will be subsequently available to link to CAD elements and/or modification.

Therefore, it is reasonable to read overall taxonomy and the link manager that organizes it on applicant's argued limitaion. Taxonomy is hierarchical organization of data whereby different sub-levels are related to each other and viewed via their linked relationships. McClendon shows the structure of behind his linking associations in Figure 2 (also see column 21, lines 6-8,

wherein "Product and built element information may potentially be communicated to and from specifications via the Link Manager," is taught).

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-form 892 for complete list of cited art.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christian P. Chace can be reached on 571-272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/021,661
Art Unit: 2165

Page 19

Neveen Abel-Jalil
Primary Examiner
October 9, 2008

/Neeven Abel-Jalil/

Examiner, Art Unit 2165